

REMARKS

By the present amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 11 and 15, and cancelled Claim 12. Claims 11 and 13-15 remain pending in the application, with Claim 11 being the sole independent claim.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected Claims 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested in light of the amendments to Claim 11.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite that the retention lip of the grid insert is sandwiched between the guide tube extending into the grid insert and the lower nozzle. Claim 11 further recites that the guide tube is secured within the grid insert by a mechanical fastener passing through the bottom end of the grid insert and secured to the guide tube. The term “fashioned” has been changed to –threaded--.

The rejection of Claim 12 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of this claim. Additionally, the amendments to Claim 11 provide proper antecedent basis for the recitations of Claim 15.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, have been addressed.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 3,791,466 (Patterson). Reconsideration of this rejection and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested based on the amendments to Claim 11.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite that each lower end of the guide tubes has an internally threaded fitting secured thereto, with the fitting having a reduced diameter portion extending into a corresponding bore defined within a lower nozzle. Referring to Figures 9-10, the manner in which the reduced diameter portion of the end fitting 84 fits within the aperture 70 in order for the screw 86 to engage the threaded bore 88 is shown. This is contrasted with Patterson, wherein the plug 40 within the end of each tube 18 is completely contained within the sleeve 36, with no portion extending below the internal shoulder 42. The present invention therefore provides greater resistance to lateral movement of the tubes with respect to the nozzle than Patterson provides. The present invention further provides a means of ensuring that the guide tube 82 is properly aligned with the lower nozzle 42 as the screw 86 is inserted into the threaded bore 88.

The rejection of Claim 12 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of this claim.

Claim 13 further recites that the grid insert is secured within the cell by welding.

Patterson teaches that the sleeve 36 is brazed to the grid 24, thereby resulting in a weaker joint than the welded joint of the present invention. Claim 14 further distinguishes over Patterson by specifying the specific type of weld.

Claims 11 and 13-15 are therefore respectfully submitted to be in condition for allowance over Patterson.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, Claims 11 and 13-15 are respectfully submitted to be in condition for allowance. If such is not the case, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative so that any additional issues may be resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

William F. Lang IV

William F. Lang, IV
Registration No. 41,928
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott
600 Grant Street, 44th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Attorney for Applicant

(412) 566-2024